Case 1:17-cv-05425-LAK Document 20 Filed 12/05/17 Page 1 of 2 Case 1:17-cv-05425-LAK Document 19 Filed 12/01/17 Page 1 of 2



ATLANTA
BALTIMORE
WILMINGTON
MIAMI
BOCA RATON
PITTSBURGH
NEWARK
LAS VEGAS
CHERRY HILL
LAKE TAHOE
MYANMAR
OMAN
A OCC REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE
OF DUNNE MORRES

ALLIANCES IN MEXICO AND SRI LANKA

December 1, 2017

MEMO ENDORSED

VIA ECF AND BY HAND

The Honorable Lewis A. Kaplan, U.S.D.J. United States District Court Southern District of New York Daniel Patrick Moynihan U.S. Courthouse 500 Pearl Street New York, New York 10007

Re:

Dr. Robert Haar, M.D. v. Nationwide Mut. Fire Ins. Co., et al.

U.S.D.C., S.D.N.Y., No. 1:17-CV-5425 (LAK)

Dear Judge Kaplan:

This firm represents Defendant Nationwide Mutual Fire Insurance Company ("Nationwide") in the above-referenced action. In accordance with the Court's Individual Rules of Practice, we respectfully submit this letter motion requesting a conference with the Court. The purpose of the conference is to discuss Nationwide's request that the Court clarify certain references to the parties its November 30, 2017 Memo Endorsement. (ECF Doc. No. 18.)

Specifically, on November 30, 2017, the Court issued its Memo Endorsement granting in part Nationwide's motion to dismiss the Complaint with respect to the first cause of action; and providing notice of the conversion of Nationwide's motion to one for summary judgment as to the second cause of action for defamation. In that connection, the Court ordered as follows:

Defendant is hereby notified that the Court will consider the investigator's declaration and the redacted OPMC complaint form for the truth of the matters asserted in deciding the motion in deciding the timeliness of the second cause of action and will convert the motion to dismiss the second cause of action on statute of limitations grounds into one for summary judgment to that extent. **Defendant** shall file any response no later than December 13, 2017.

DUANE MORRIS LLP

Duane Morris

The Honorable Lewis A. Kaplan, U.S.D.J. December 1, 2017 Page 2

Further, if *defendant* has no good faith basis for adhering to his allegation that the OPMC complaint was made in or about July 2016, he would be well advised to withdraw that assertion. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. ll(b).

(Memo Endorsement at 3; emphases added.)

Based on the context of the above passage, it appears that the Court intended that the emphasized references should have been to "Plaintiff" as opposed to "Defendant." Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Court exercise its discretion to schedule a conference to clarify whether it intended to notify Plaintiff of its obligation upon conversion of Nationwide's motion.

We appreciate Your Honor's attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

andrew T. Hahn, Sr.

ATH

cc:

Gregory Zimmer, Esq. (By ECF) Ralph Carter, Esq. (By ECF)

The memo entorcement

is modefred to phyche true

bold facel word (as about)

bold facel word (as about)

I defendant "pleanth."

for word "pleanth."

for word to the motion

deveel so the motion

deveel so the motion

by a long force of

level of the motion

for all the motion

for al